

Remarks

Claims 1, 2, 7-11, and 14-20 are pending in this application. Claims 3-6 and 12-13 are cancelled herein. Claims 1, 7, 9, and 14 are currently amended. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Additionally, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-20 as being obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,785,805 to House (hereinafter “House”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,136,908 to Cline (hereinafter “Cline”).

Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. 112

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-20 as being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner states that it is not clear which component of the integrated computer network receives the service directory data used for configuration and which component of the existing customer network provides the service directory data used for configuration. (Office Action, p.2) Applicants have amended each of independent claims 1, 7, 9, and 14 such that it is now clear that the processing unit of the integrated computer network receives the service directory data from the domain controller of the existing customer network. As such, Applicants believe that it is now clear which components of each network do the sending or receiving of the service directory data. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 112 be withdrawn.

Claims 1-20 are Not Obvious Over House and Cline

A prima facie case of obviousness requires a showing that all of the claim limitations of the rejected claims are taught or suggested by the prior art. Manual of Patent Examining Procedure 2143 and 2143.03. “All words of a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.” In re Wilson, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165

U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (CCPA 1970). Claims 1-20 are not obvious over the combination of House and Cline because the combination fails to teach or suggest all of the elements of the Applicants' claims. Specifically, the combination of House and Cline fails to teach or suggest at least the step of updating data (such as a service directory) on the integrated computer network after it has been received by the customer in order to reflect changes since the service directory was established on, built on, or synchronized with the integrated computer network, as required by the claims of the present invention.

The present invention is advantageous due to the reduction of involvement of the customer in the process of configuring and installing a computer network. (Spec., p.4, lines 15-27) Specifically, because the manufactured network is integrated and sent as a pre-configured, single unit, the work the customer must do to render the integrated network operational is minimal. The customer needs only to update the service directory data of the ordered integrated computer network (once received) to reflect changes occurring since the initial transmission of service directory data from the customer to the manufacturer during the pre-configuration stage. (Spec., p.4, lines 1-15) The step of updating the service directory data of the integrated computer network is important, however, because the service directory reflects the computer resources of the computer network and, additionally, may also play an active role in managing the distributed resources of the computer network. (Spec., p.9, lines 3-6) Thus, the system and methods of the present invention allows for minimal work on the part of the customer, but ensure that the service directory data of the integrated computer network is current after receipt by the customer so that the integrated computer network may **properly function with** the existing computer network of the customer.

In contrast to the present invention, the combination of House and Cline fails to teach or suggest the step of updating service directory data on the integrated computer network, after it has been received by the customer, in order to reflect changes since the service directory was established on, built on, or synchronized with the integrated computer network. The Examiner referred to the previous Office Action, dated March 20, 2007, for the rejection of the claims under section 103. In the previous office action, the Examiner cites House as teaching an online build-to-order system in which a customer is able to place an order for a network. (3/20/2007 OA, p.2) The Examiner likens the online configuration mentioned briefly in House at column 16, line 41 to establishing a communication link and transferring data but acknowledges that House fails to teach transferring data concerning a service directory. (3/20/2007 OA, p.2) At best, House discloses network-based methods and systems for the configuration of test, automation and measurement systems, but never specifically cites built-to-order networks. (House, Abstract) In the Argument section of the present office action, the Examiner states that the Applicants' claimed method is not for building a computer network. (Office Action, p.3) Applicants do not agree with the Examiner's characterization of the Applicants' invention or the Examiner's statements regarding what the Applicants have allegedly admitted regarding the references. Specifically, Applicants believe that the claims of the present invention clearly lay out that the present invention is directed to providing, manufacturing, or assembling an integrated computer network for a customer, as is seen in the language of each and every claim. This is not taught by House.

Additionally, House fails to teach or suggest **updating service directory data** on the integrated computer network, after it has been received by the customer, in order to reflect changes since the service directory was established on, built on, or synchronized with the

integrated computer network. The Examiner has not discussed how House teaches or suggests the step of updating service directory data on the received integrated computer network. House does not teach or suggest updating data once it is received by a customer, as the final step in the methods of House are checking out or purchasing of products, with **no mention of updating** data at the customer site. (House, Figs 5-7) Thus, House, fails to teach or suggest updating service directory data once the integrated network is received by the customer, as required by the claims of the present invention.

The Examiner cites Cline as teaching transferring a service directory from one network to another in claims 1 and 12-14 of Cline. (3/20/2007 OA, p.2) However, the Examiner fails to show how Cline teaches or suggests **updating service directory data** on the integrated computer network, after it has been received by the customer, in order to reflect changes since the service directory was established on, built on, or synchronized with the integrated computer network. Cline teaches configuring network services, but fails to teach or suggest the updating of any type of data, and specifically fails to teach or suggest the updating of service directory data on an integrated computer network after it has been received by a customer. (Cline, Abstract)

Because the above elements of the independent claims are not shown by the combination of House and Cline, a *prima facie* case of obviousness is not established. Applicants believe that the amendments made herein place the pending claims in condition for allowance. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the independent claims and all base claims which depend therefrom should be passed to issuance.

No Waiver

All of Applicants' arguments and amendments are without prejudice or disclaimer. Additionally, Applicants have merely discussed example distinctions from the

references. Other distinctions may exist, and Applicants reserve the right to discuss these additional distinctions in a later Response or on Appeal, if appropriate. By not responding to additional statements made by the Examiner, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Examiner's additional statements, such as, for example, any statements relating to what would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art. The example distinctions discussed by Applicants are sufficient to overcome the obviousness rejection.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that pending claims 1, 2, 7-11, and 14-20 of the present invention are allowable. Applicants respectfully request that these claims be passed to issuance.

Respectfully submitted,



Roger Fulghum
Registration No. 39,678

Baker Botts L.L.P.
910 Louisiana
One Shell Plaza
Houston, Texas 77002-4995
(713) 229-1707

Baker Botts Docket Number: 016295.1575

Date: October 31, 2007